



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,922	01/26/2004	Carles Borrego Bel	LEAR8136ESPUSA	1921
34007	7590	12/14/2007	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. / LEAR CORPORATION 1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238			PARRIES, DRUM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/707,922	Applicant(s) BORREGO BEL ET AL.
	Examiner Dru M. Parries	Art Unit 2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application _____
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Since the petition was granted, the Examiner acknowledges the benefit claimed to International Application PCT/ES02/00373. A new ground of rejection has been made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinas et al. (6,507,506), Maeda (6,340,848), Akerson (6,344,985), and Flick (6,756,885). Pinas teaches a vehicle with a dual voltage electrical system comprising two networks at different voltage levels (R42 and R14), where each network can feed the other via a bi-directional DC-DC converter (62). He also teaches several equal shunted DC/DC converters (62, 64), connecting the first and second networks, being connected at a common point (left of 65). Both networks are fed via a battery (B12 and B36) and one is connected to a generator (A). He also teaches loads not being able to be fully supported via one source, so converters, and the other network battery, help to provide support to the one network by supplying the extra power needed to supply to the loads; hence the need for the bi-directional converter (62). He also teaches a control unit which controls the converter's output to each load (Col. 7, lines 4-15). Pinas fails to explicitly teach having each converter having its own set of loads nor does he teach protection means in some of the loads of each set. Maeda teaches a power distribution system in

a vehicle comprising sets of 14V loads (normal load) and 42V loads (large capacity load) in different parts of the vehicle each connected to a distribution box containing a DC/DC converter corresponding to each set of loads. He also teaches fuses (31f, 31d, 33f, 33d, 35d, 35f) protecting the all loads in each set (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a plurality of DC/DC converters assigned to particular sets of loads to minimize the amount of wires running through the system (Maeda-Col. 5, lines 34-42) and to have more accurate voltage outputs to each of the different sets of loads. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate fuses into the load side of the converters to protect the loads from over current or over voltage.

Pinas fails to explicitly teach at least two bi-directional DC/DC converters being used in his electrical system. Akerson teaches an electrical system that could be used in a vehicle having different voltage networks (Col. 1, lines 11-15). He goes on to teach the use of a plurality of bi-directional DC/DC converters (102a, 104a) in the system (Fig. 7): It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the plurality of bi-directional DC/DC converters of Akerson into the vehicle electrical system of the Pinas/Maeda combination, so that the system can transfer power in either direction at a plurality of different points throughout the vehicle and therefore would minimize wires and also create a more efficient system in the case where power from one network needs to be supplied to the other at various points throughout the vehicle.

Pinas also fails to explicitly teach how the control unit communicates with the converters and the rest of the supply system. Flick teaches a vehicle control system using a high-speed

communications bus, for example, the CAN standard (Col. 5, lines 5-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a CAN high-speed communication bus since they are known to be used in the vehicles art and Pinas was silent on this issue.

4. Claims 2, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinas et al. (6,507,506), Maeda (6,340,848), Akerson (6,344,985), and Flick (6,756,885) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Nonaka (JP 08-111932 A). Pinas, Maeda, Akerson, and Flick teach a vehicle power distribution system as described above. Pinas teaches a controller that controls the output of the converters (Col. 7, lines 4-15). Maeda teaches each set of 42V loads each being associated with a DC/DC converter. Pinas fails to explicitly teach detecting the current required by the loads. Nonaka teaches detecting the power requirement of a load. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to, via some point in the circuit, detect the current required by each load, so that Pinas' controller will know what voltage to output from the converters to properly feed the loads.

5. Claims 5, 6, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinas et al. (6,507,506), Maeda (6,340,848), Akerson (6,344,985), and Flick (6,756,885) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kolbas et al. (6,201,678). Pinas, Maeda, Akerson, and Flick teach a vehicle power distribution system as described above. Pinas also teaches the use of power switches in vehicle systems, such as FETs (Col. 4, lines 62-65). They fail to teach the use of fuses and switches as protecting means for the loads. Kolbas teaches the use of both fuses and controlled switches (26, 38, 44, 34, 46) as protection means (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

implement fuses and switches into some of the load circuits to include extra protection against over current and over voltage.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

12-10-2007



12/10/07

MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800